



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/500,917

03/28/2005

Stefan Zikeli

041165-9064-00

8398

23409 7590 01/09/2008
MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP
100 E WISCONSIN AVENUE
Suite 3300
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202

EXAMINER

LEYSON, JOSEPH S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1791

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/09/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/500,917	Applicant(s) ZIKELI ET AL.	
	Examiner Joseph Leyson	Art Unit 1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 July 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>see office action</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of Group I, apparatus claims 1-26, in the reply filed on October 4, 2007 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The Information Disclosure Statements filed on 7/8/2004, 6/23/2005, 9/29/2005, 6/5/2006, 9/5/2006, 10/16/2006, 11/17/2006, 3/1/2007, 4/27/2007, 8/9/2007 and 11/7/2007 have been considered. Crossed out references on the Forms PTO-1449 are duplicates which were previously cited in this case.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "11" has been used to designate both a curtain (p. 13) and a bath surface (i.e., pp. 13-15) and because reference character "16" has been used to designate both an axis (i.e., p. 14) and a direction (i.e., p. 14).

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the

changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 25 (i.e., p. 18).

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

5. The drawings are objected to because of the following:

in fig. 2, the pointing line of "16" should point to the axis of the cooling gas stream 15; and

in fig. 3, the distance "A" should extend from the exit of the cooling gas stream 15 from the blowing means 14 to the last row 22 of molded bodies 5 (i.e., p. 16). Figure 3 incorrectly shows the distance "A" only to the FIRST row of molded bodies 5.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

6. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.

- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

7. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

the title should be amended to reflected the claimed subject matter, i.e.,
apparatus only; and

in the specification for clarity, on p. 15, line 16, "cooling area 16" should be changed to --cooling area 19--; on p. 16, line 12, "direction" should be changed to --axis-
-; on p. 16, line 13, "vertical" should be changed to --horizontal-- (as shown in fig. 2);
and on p. 18, line 4, "expansion zone 25" should be changed to --expansion zone 24--.

Appropriate correction is required.

8. The amendment filed July 8, 2004, replacing page 6, is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the

invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the subject matter underlined in the last three lines of replacement page 6 are not originally disclosed.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

9. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the subject matter of claims 7, 8 and 14.

Claim Objections

10. Claim 23 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim 23 only further recites limitations of the material to be processed by the claimed apparatus, which is related to the intended use of the claimed apparatus, and thus has no patentable weight. A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987); see MPEP 2114. "Expressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining patentability of the apparatus claim." *Ex parte Thibault*, 164 USPQ 666, 667 (Bd. App. 1969). Furthermore, "[i]nclusion of material or article worked upon by a structure being claimed does not

impart patentability to the claims." In re Young, 75 F.2d 996, 25 USPQ 69 (CCPA 1935) (as restated in In re Otto, 312 F.2d 937, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963)). See MPEP 2115.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claims 11, 14, 16, 20, 22 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 11, "the first row" lacks antecedent basis making it unclear to what it refers.

In claim 14, "the boundary area", "the cooling area" and "the first shielding zone" lack antecedent basis making it unclear to what it refers.

In claim 16, "in row direction" cannot be understood because no extrusion orifice rows have been recited in claims 16, 4 and 1.

In claim 20, "in row direction" cannot be understood because no extrusion orifice rows have been recited in claims 20, 8, 7 and 1; and "the individual cooling gas streams" lacks antecedent basis making it unclear to what it refers (it appears claim 20 should be dependent upon claim 19).

In claim 22, "the direction of passage" cannot be understood because "passage" is not related to any of the claim elements. The examiner suggests changing it to --the direction of passage of the continuously molded bodies--.

In claim 24, "the cooling area" lacks antecedent basis making it unclear to what it refers; "extrusion orifice" should be changed to --the extrusion orifice-- for antecedent basis clarity; and "the direction of passage" should be changed to --the direction of passage of the continuously molded bodies-- for clarity as to what passage direction.

In claim 25, "the cooling area" and "the row" lack antecedent basis making it unclear to what it refers; and "the direction of passage" (line 2) should be changed to --the direction of passage of the continuously molded bodies-- for clarity as to what passage direction; "from the blowing means" (line 6) should be changed to --to the blowing means-- for clarity so as to clearly understand the end points the distance H; and "flow direction" (line 9) should be changed to --flow direction of the cooling gas stream-- for clarity as to which flow direction.

In claim 26, "the cooling area" and "the row" lack antecedent basis making it unclear to what it refers; and "the direction of passage" (line 2) should be changed to --the direction of passage of the continuously molded bodies-- for clarity as to what passage direction; "flow direction" (line 7) should be changed to --flow direction of the cooling gas stream-- for clarity as to which flow direction; and "in the direction of passage" (line 9) should be deleted for clarity because the height B is in a direction transverse to the cooling gas stream direction, NOT in the direction of the passage, as understood from the instant specification (i.e., p. 16).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

15. Claims 1-14 and 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 96/21758 in view of Haynes et al. (US 6,117,379).

WO 96/21758 discloses an apparatus for producing continuously molded bodies from a molding material, such as a spinning solution containing cellulose, water and tertiary amine oxide, comprising a multitude of extrusion orifices, in a spinneret 2, through which during operation the molding material can be extruded into continuously molded bodies 4, a precipitation bath 5 and an air gap 3 arranged between the extrusion orifices and the precipitation bath 5, and a blowing means 7 for producing a cooling gas stream, the continuously molded bodies 5 being passed during operation in successive order through the air gap 3 and the precipitation bath 5, and the cooling gas stream being directed in the area of the air gap 3 to the continuously molded bodies 5. Note that the depth of cooling gas stream is 3 to 10 mm (i.e., claim 4), whereas the

depth of the air gap is 10-160 mm (i.e., claim 2). Therefore, the air gap between the extrusion orifices and the cooling gas stream forms a first shielding zone, and the air gap between the cooling gas stream and the bath form a second shielding zone. The cooling gas stream flows substantially in parallel with a plane in which the extrusion orifices are positioned on average (i.e., p. 3, lines 2-8). The cooling stream is substantially transverse to the direction of travel of the filaments (i.e., p. 3, lines 3-8).

Note that if the cooling stream is NOT totally transverse to the direction of travel of the filaments, then the cooling gas stream would have a velocity component oriented into the direction of passage. However, WO 96/21758 does not disclose the cooling gas stream being turbulent at least at the exit from the blowing means.

Haynes et al. (US 6,117,379) discloses that it is well known and conventional in the art to provide turbulent quench (cooling) gas streams to extruded filaments, so long as the filaments are not unduly disturbed or broken (i.e., col. 1, lines 6-67). Haynes et al. (US 6,117,379) also discloses placing a bar arrangement 10 at an exit to a blowing means (i.e., col. 6, lines 51-67) to increase the turbulence at the exit which flows across layers (rows) of filaments of the so as to increase the heat transfer rate without unduly disturbing or breaking the filaments (i.e., col. 1, lines 54-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the apparatus of WO 96/21758 such that the cooling gas stream is turbulent at least at the exit from the blowing means because it is well known and conventional in the art to provide turbulent cooling gas flow across the filaments (or across the rows of filaments) to cool the filaments so long as the filaments are not

unduly disturbed or broken, as disclosed by Haynes et al. (US 6,117,379). As to the characteristics of the cooling gas flow, such as the Reynolds number, velocity, width, specific blowing force, distance of the cooling area from the extrusion orifice in the direction of passage of the filaments, the distance l (instant claim 25) and the height L (instant claim 26), as respectively recited by the instant claims, such characteristics would have been found due to routine experimentation in finding optimum or operable characteristics of the cooling gas flow relative to other process and apparatus parameters, such as material to be extruded, number of extrusion holes, etc., in view of the teachings of WO 96/21758 and Haynes et al. (US 6,117,379).

16. Claims 15, 16, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 96/21758 in view of Haynes et al. (US 6,117,379) as applied to claims 1-14 and 21-26 above, and further in view of White et al. (US 5,639,484).

White et al. (US 5,639,484) discloses an apparatus (i.e., fig. 7) including a spinneret 124 with extrusion orifices forming filaments 125, and a blowing means 121 producing a cooling gas stream, the orifices being arranged on a substantially rectangular base in rows in a direction transverse to the direction of the cooling gas stream (i.e., fig. 7), wherein the number of the extrusion orifices in row direction is greater than in the cooling gas stream direction (i.e., fig. 7), wherein the width (D) of the cooling gas stream in a direction transverse to the direction of the passage of the filaments through the air gap is larger than the height (B) of the cooling gas stream in the direction of passage (i.e., fig. 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to further modify the apparatus with the spinneret and blowing means of White et al. (US 5,639,484) because such a modification would provide an art recognized alternative configuration for the spinneret and blowing means, as disclosed by White et al. (US 5,639,484), to produce rows of filaments followed by cross draft cooling.

17. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 96/21758 in view of Haynes et al. (US 6,117,379) as applied to claims 1-14 and 21-26 above, and further in view of Patel (US 3,932,576).

Patel (US 3,932,576) discloses a precipitation bath 16 having disposed therein a deflector 30 by which during operation filaments 22 are deflected as a substantially planar curtain to the precipitation bath surface (i.e., figs. 1 and 2), and, outside of the precipitation bath 16, a bundling means 23, 25 is provided by which during operation the filaments 22 are united to form a fiber bundle.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to further modify the apparatus with the deflector and bundling means of Patel (US 3,932,576) because such a modification would provide an art recognized alternative means for collecting the filament product, as disclosed by Patel (US 3,932,576).

18. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 96/21758 in view of Haynes et al. (US 6,117,379) as applied to claims 1-14 and 21-26 above, and further in view of Nichols et al. (US 4,033,742).

Nichols et al. (US 4,033,742) disclose a blowing means including nozzles 6 producing a plurality of individual cooling gas streams arranged side by side in row direction of extrusion orifices enabling cooling across the width of a spinneret (i.e., figs. 1 and 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to further modify the apparatus with a plurality of individual cooling gas streams arranged side by side in a row direction of the extrusion orifices because such a modification is well known and conventional in the art and would provide an art recognized alternative configuration for the blowing means which enables cooling across the width of the spinneret, as disclosed by Nichols et al. (US 4,033,742).

Double Patenting

19. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

20. Claims 1-26 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24 of copending Application No. 10/500,998 in view of Haynes et al. (US 6,117,379).

Claims 1-24 of copending Application No. 10/500,998 disclose the apparatus, substantially as claimed, except for the cooling gas stream being turbulent at least at the exit from the blowing means. Haynes et al. (US 6,117,379) is applied as above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the apparatus of claims 1-24 of copending Application No. 10/500,998 such that the cooling gas stream is turbulent at least at the exit from the blowing means because it is well known and conventional in the art to provide turbulent cooling gas flow across the filaments (or across the rows of filaments) to cool the filaments so long as the filaments are not unduly disturbed or broken, as disclosed by Haynes et al. (US 6,117,379). As to the characteristics of the cooling gas flow, not disclosed by claims 1-24 of copending Application No. 10/500,998, such as the Reynolds number, velocity, width, specific blowing force, and distance of the cooling area from the extrusion orifice in the direction of passage of the filaments, as respectively recited by the instant claims, such characteristics would have been found due to routine experimentation in finding optimum or operable characteristics of the cooling gas flow relative to other process and apparatus parameters, such as material to be extruded, number of extrusion holes, etc., in view of the teachings of Haynes et al. (US 6,117,379). Furthermore, where the only difference between the prior art and the claims is a recitation of relative dimensions of

the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device is not patentably distinct from the prior art device, In Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc., 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984). .

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Leyson whose telephone number is (571) 272-5061. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gupta Yogendra can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/500,917
Art Unit: 1791

Page 16

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert B. Davis/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1791
1/7/08


JL